REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 12 and 13 were provisionally rejected for double patenting in view of application 09/921,465; claims 1, 3 and 6-7 were rejected as anticipated by Jahn; claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 14-20 were rejected as anticipated by Madden; and claims 1, 4 and 12-20 were rejected as anticipated by Friel.

As to the double patenting rejection, the claims of the co-pending application 09/921,465 were amended after the present Office action was issued. It is believed that the two pending applications no longer have claims subject to an obviousness type double patenting rejection, and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 1 and 6 are amended to recite that the configuration program presents a menu of material application system hardware component selection options. The art of record makes no suggestion of such a claimed system. None of Friel, Madden or Jahn relate to configuring a material application system as claimed to include remotely accessing a manufacturing site and configuring hardware for a material application system.

The Jahn reference discloses a system that includes a facility in which paint is being applied. The Office Action references, in particular, Figures 6A and 6B. These figures show computer screens for a paint simulation program which can be used to "vary" parameters virtually of a paint applicator in the facility (such as "Bell speed" in a rotary atomizer) to predict characteristics of the resulting coating of paint which would be applied by the paint applicator (such as the paint film build).

These screens could not be used to select hardware components or originally configure a system of hardware components for applying a material such as paint. The system disclosed in the Jahn patent does not provide a menu to permit the selection of paint system hardware components, check for the compatibility of those hardware components or provide an animated representation of those components for the user to view. Thus, the claims are not anticipated by this reference.

The Madden reference discloses a system for controlling the assembly line of an automotive manufacturing plant. Vehicles are identified by their VIN number and are built according to a "build sheet" which accompanies the vehicle. The degree of completion of the vehicles is monitored as the vehicles moves through the plant. Vehicle routing can be controlled depending on degree of completion of the vehicle, status of the build sheet, etc. Terminals 212

are provided throughout the plant to enable workers and managers to input work just done on a vehicle to update its status in the database. The system can not be used to configure the hardware components which comprise a material application system. Painting equipment is present in the factory which is being monitored using this system, but this equipment was not configured using the system disclosed in the Madden reference. The system in Madden is capable of recording when a vehicle has been painted. If it has, the vehicle can be stored in PBS (painted body storage). That appears to be the extent of the Madden systems involvement with the painting equipment, however.

The Office Action states that Madden discloses a system for configuring a spraying application system having a configuration program which presents components selection options and verifies components compatibility. These teachings can not be found in the Madden specification. A customer could not use the Madden system to configure a material application system from a menu of hardware components, test for compatibility of those hardware components or see a representation of the system configured by the user. Hence, the claims are not anticipated by this reference.

The Freil patent application is directed to a system for mixing the various liquid components of paint in the proper ratio. The patent does not mention or discuss paint application equipment or the hardware components used to construct a paint application system. It is stated in the Office Action that Friel discloses a spray application system providing a configuration program which presents components selection options and verifies components compatibility. These teachings can not be found in the Friel specification.

The program in Friel could not be used to enable a customer to configure a coating system online from a menu of hardware components, test for the compatibility of the hardware components selected by the user or view an animated display of the system so configured by the user. As with the prior two references, the claims are not anticipated by this reference

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Sept 20, 2004

By: _____
Leonard L. Lewis, Reg. No. 31,176
Customer No. 27483